

REMARKS

At the outset, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the claim amendments made herein do not adequately resolve the issues identified by the Examiner in the pending Office Action.

Summary of the Office Action

Claims 1-3, 10, 12, 13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kubota et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0171792) in view of Mitsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,408,345) in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,123,325) and further in view of Official Notice/ARA (Applicants' Related Art).

Claims 4, 5, 14, 15 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and Official Notice/ARA as applied above, and further in view of You (U.S. Patent No. 7,023,508).

Claims 8, 9, 11, 17, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and Official Notice/ARA as applied above, and further in view of Official Notice.

Summary of the Amendment

Claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

All Claims Recite Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 1-3, 10, 12, 13 and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kubota et al. (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0171792) in view

of Mitsui et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,408,345) in view of Maeda et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,123,325) and further in view of Official Notice/ARA (Applicants' Related Art). Claims 4, 5, 14, 15 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and Official Notice/ARA as applied above, and further in view of You (U.S. Patent No. 7,023,508). Claims 8, 9, 11, 17, 18 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and Official Notice/ARA as applied above, and further in view of Official Notice. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) for at least the following reasons.

The Office Action states that “the Examiner stated in the previous office action that the critical difference between the *Mitsui* structure as applied previously and the structure of applicant’s disclosed invention seems to be that the reflective layer does not overlap ‘any of the electrode attached to the drain region of the TFT’...and the limitation which the Examiner did address (regarding the reflective layer not overlapping ‘any of the electrode attached to the drain region of the TFT’) is in no way reflected in the amended claim language.” Page 3, lines 7-16. Without conceding to the assertions of the pending Office Action and in order to expedite prosecution of this application, independent claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 have been amended to recite, in part, for example, “the drain electrode being an electrode attached to a drain region of the thin film transistor” and “the reflective layer disposed on the pixel region and not overlapping the drain electrode”, which substantially reflects the above Examiner’s statement. As the pending Office Action has admitted that *Mitsui* fails to teach or suggest at least these features, the rejection of claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21 should be withdrawn.

All the claimed limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention. Because Kubota et al., Mitsui et al., Maeda et al., and ARA, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each feature of independent claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) should be withdrawn. Furthermore, claims 2-5, 8-9, 11, 13-15, 17-18, and 20 depend from one of independent claims 1, 10, 12, 19, and 21. Accordingly, claims 2-5, 8-9, 11, 13-15, 17-18, and 20 are also allowable because of the additional features they recite and the reasons stated above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and the timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of the Response, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account

No. 50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 30, 2010

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP

Morgan, Lewis & Bockius LLP
Customer No. 09629

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
202-739-3000

By: /Mary Jane Boswell/
Mary Jane Boswell
Reg. No. 33,652